



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,219	12/18/2000	Alejandro Wiechers	10001310-I	3213
7590	02/25/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			CHEN, TE Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/747,219	WIECHERS, ALEJANDRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Y Chen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11,12 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11,12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/15/2005.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12 and 14-20, are pending for examination, claims 1, 12, 15 and 20 have been amended, claims 2, 5-6, 10 and 13 have been canceled.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 11 is objected because this claim depends on claim 10 which has been canceled. In order to further process the instant invention, the examiner will assume this claim depends on claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,214).

As to claims 1, 3-4, 7, Rhoads discloses a network assembly processing system, comprising:

a) a reference repository [e.g., the Bedoop registry (34), Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 5-7], wherein, the reference repository receives the electronic file from the communication network including Internet [e.g., the network 18, Fig. 1; col. 2, line 66] and stores the characteristic information associated with the electronic file [col. 4, lines 5-11]. Rhoads further discloses that the electronic file comprises published material [e.g., the published Magazines, the Web page; col. 4, lines 19-26; col. 11, lines 37-40; col. 15, lines 15-35].

b) an indexing unit [e.g., the DSN units: 50, 56, Fig. 2] linked with the reference repository [e.g., the Master Registration Server, the class servers (48a-c), Fig. 2], wherein, the indexing unit assigns an identification code [e.g., a UID code of a particular Class and DNS] to the electronic file respect to the associated characteristic data [e.g., col. 10, line 66 - col. 11, line 8; col. 11, lines 20-44];

c) an editing unit linked with the reference repository and the indexing unit, wherein, the editing unit insert the identification code to the electronic file [e.g., the editing tools at col. 10, lines 18-26; col. 53, lines 50-64].

As to claim 8, except all the restrictions cited in claim 7, Rhoads further discloses that the system stores the identification code with respect the characteristic information [e.g., col. 11, lines 12-18].

As to claim 9, except all the restrictions cited in claim 7, Rhoads further discloses that the identification code comprises a set of specific identification code [e.g., the class, DNS and UID of a Bedoop code, col. 10, lines 30-32].

As to claim 11, except all the restrictions cited in claim 1, Rhoads further discloses that the editing unit formats the identification code with respect to the electronic file [e.g., see the section Data structures, Formats, Protocols, and Infrastructures section at col. 7 – col. 9; col. 30, lines 41-43; col. 32, lines 30-39].

As to claim 12, except all the restrictions cited in claim 1, Rhoads further discloses that the system comprises a review unit linked with the indexing unit wherein the review unit dispatches the formatted electronic file from the network assembly [e.g., the DNS Servers (50), DNS Leaf Node server (56), Fig. 2; col. 10, lines 30 – 43].

As to claim 14, except all the restrictions cited in claim 12, Rhoads further discloses that the review unit [e.g., the Web browser 40, Fig. 2] dispatches the formatted electronic file from the network assembly to a client [e.g., col. 21, lines 50 – col. 22, lines 7].

As to claims 15-20, these claims recited the same features as claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12 and 14, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 11/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's argument that the prior art of Rhoads fails to disclose or suggest of a network assemble for assigning an identification code to an electronic file from a communications network.

In reply to this argument, the examiner points out that Rhoads' clearly discloses his system will use any of the broad ranges of printing and processing techniques to mark /or assign a "Bedoop" code to an object that can be quickly read and acted upon by an appropriately configure device, computer or appliance [e.g., col. 1, lines 48-58]. Rhoads further discloses the payload of the Bedoop code contains Class ID, DNS and UID fields, wherein Class ID is the top level to indicate the type of an object, the DNS ID is the middle level corresponds to an internet server address, and the UID is the finest level of granularity, and can be analogized to internet pages on a particular server. The Class ID and DNS ID collectively indicate to the system what sort of Bedoop data is on the object. In the case of Bedoop systems that rely on remote servers, the Class and DNS Ids are used to identify the server computer that will respond to the Bedoop data,

the UID determines precisely what response should be provided [e.g., col. 7, lines 7-36]. In addition, Rhoads' discloses an architecture employing the forgoing arrangement at Fig. 2, col. 8, lines 8-40. Moreover, Rhoads further discloses internet service provider can likewise provide simple tools permitting subscribers to make use of DNS leaf node servers, the tools assigns each subscriber up to 20 UIDs to define a corresponding web address for each UID, such that when a Bedoop application led to that DNS leaf node server, and presented one of these UIDs, the server would instruct the originating computer to load and present the web page at the corresponding web address [e.g., col. 10, lines 66 –col. 11, line 8]. Thus, contrary to applicant's argument, Rhoads successfully disclose a network assembly for assigning an identification code to an electronic file from a communication network.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., characteristic information is information related to each e-file for use in inserting a library specific identification code on that e-file and the library specific is internal procedures uniquely applied by each library for operating that library) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Haverstock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,607) which discloses a Web page server provides role-based multi-level security;

Holmes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,108) which discloses a secure electronic publishing system.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahić can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

February 20, 2005


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER